DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 492 UD 017 156

AUTHOR Leaf, Jeanette B.
TITLE Tutoring: Walk and Talk Program, 1975-1976 Academic Year.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 33p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 20-63409

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *After School Tutoring; *Bilingual Students; *Chinese; Communication Skills; *Elementary Education; High School Students; *Immigrants; Programed Materials; Program Evaluation; Remedial Mathematics; Remedial Reading; *Spanish Speaking; *Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS New York (New York); Umbrella Projects

ABSTRACT

This report evaluated the seventh year of an after school tutorial program designed to provide extra instruction to students who were recent immigrants to New York City or who came from bilingual homes. The primary objective of the program was the improvement of the students' basic skills, namely reading, communications, and mathematics. One hundred seventy-six students from grades one to six were enrolled in the program. The majority of the students came from Chinese or Spanish speaking homes. Students were selected for participation in the program on the basis of teacher-counselor recommendation and academic need. Students were divided into five bilingual and basic skills groups and received intensive and individualized instruction six to ten hours weekly from teachers, educational assistants and high school students who served as tutors. The Stanford Achievement Tests were administered to every student on a pre and post test basis. Questionnaires were administered to all participants in the program. Statistical analyses illustrated significant differences between the pre and post-test results in reading, mathematics, and communications skills. The report concluded that in every instance, the grade equivalent increase was equal to or in excess of the six-month duration of the program being evaluated. The appendix contains the questionnaires which were developed and administered by the program coordinator to the students, educational assistants, and teachers. (Author/JP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

EVALUATION REPORT

ED141492

Function No. 20-63409

TUTORING: WALK AND TALK PROGRAM

1975-1976 ACADEMIC YEAR

Dr. Jeanette B. Leaf

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

An Evaluation of Selected New York City Umbrella Programs funded under a Special Grant of the New York State Legislature performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-1976 school year

UDO 17156

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROGRAM	1
II.	EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES	3
	Evaluation Objectives	3
	Data Gathering Instruments	3
	Sampling Procedures	4
	Dates of Evaluative Procedures	5
	Methods of Data Treatment	5
III.	FINDINGS	7
	Demographic Findings	7
	Evaluation Objectives Findings	8
	Questionnaire Findings	11
IV.	SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	13
	TABLES	15
	APPENDIX	24

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS IN TUTORING: WALK AND TALK PROGRAM.....	15
II.	PROGRAM ENROLLMENT AND ATTRITION.....	16
III.	1975-76 PROGRAM ORGANIZATION: ORIGINAL GROUP ASSIGNMENTS.....	17
IV.	GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM TUTORS.....	18
V.	t-TESTS FOR VARIABLES AUDITORY, READING, AND MATHEMATICS: PRE-TEST, POST-TEST COMPARISON OF MEANS.....	19
VI.	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A COMPARISON OF TEST PERFORMANCE BY GRADE.....	20
VII.	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A COMPARISON OF TEST PERFORMANCE BY SEX.....	21
VIII.	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A COMPARISON OF TEST PERFORMANCE BY SESSIONS ATTENDED.....	22
IX.	A COMPARISON OF PRE-TEST, POST-TEST GRADE EQUIVALENT DIFFERENCES BY CRITERION 60% OF SESSIONS ATTENDED.....	23

TUTORING: WALK AND TALK PROGRAM

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROGRAM

The Tutoring: Walk and Talk Program is an after-school program designed to provide extra instruction and tutoring to children who are recent immigrants or who come from bilingual homes. It is located at P.S. 2M in New York City where it has been functioning for seven years. The over-riding educational objective of the program is improvement of the participants' basic skills, namely reading, communications, and mathematics. Eligibility for admission into the program is determined by the rating obtained on the New York City Fluency Test, priority being given to those with the greatest academic need.

During the 1975-76 academic year at any given time approximately 130 students from grades 1-6 were enrolled in the program.* They were divided into five bilingual and basic skills groups. The majority of the students came from Chinese- or Spanish-speaking ethnic groups. Students received intensive and individualized instruction six to ten hours weekly from licensed teachers, educational assistants, and tutors.

The three basic methods of instruction that were used in this program are: 1) Group instruction in the areas of language, communication, reading, and mathematics by teachers and staff fluent in students' native languages; 2) Small group instruction in study

*Three students in grades 7 and 8 were in the program on a visitor basis.

skills and communication by educational assistants and student aides under the direct supervision of a teacher; 3) Individualized instruction by tutors in basic skills and homework help.

Extensive use was made of creative materials and projects, many of which were developed by the staff. Programmed instruction texts were heavily relied upon to accommodate individual rates of learning. Among the group projects were four "walking and talking" Saturday field trips to educational and cultural sites in New York City, these trips providing the stimulus for discussions and various assignments.

The Tutoring: Walk and Talk Program as scheduled for the 1975-76 academic year began to fully function on October 14, 1975, and ended activities on May 28, 1976. By the end of the academic year tutoring was provided to program participants on 135 days.

CHAPTER TWO

EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

I. Evaluation Objectives

Based on the objectives as set forth in the program description, the following are the evaluation objectives of this study:

Evaluation Objective #1: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the Reading component of the program, the reading grade level of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test score and the post-test score.

Evaluation Objective #2: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the Mathematics component of the program, the mathematics grade level of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test score and the post-test score.

Evaluation Objective #3: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the Communications Skills component of the program, the communication skills grade level of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test score and the post-test score.

Evaluation Objective #4: To determine whether the implementation of the program coincides with the program as described in the project proposal.

II. Data Gathering Instruments

Stanford Achievement Test Battery

The Stanford Achievement Tests are a comprehensive battery assessing students' achievement level in Auditory, Reading, and Mathematics skills. Depending on grade level, either Level I, II, or III of the Primary Battery was administered to every student

participant on a pre-test, post-test basis.

Tutor and Tutee Personal Data Form

A Personal Data form was constructed for tutors and tutees in order to obtain basic demographic data. This data was intended to provide a precise description of the program population, and a basis for inter-group comparisons. Among the data requested were Sex, Date of Birth, Place of Birth, Languages Spoken, and Ethnic Group Identification.

Questionnaires

Questionnaires were constructed and administered by the program coordinator to both tutees and staff. Tutors, tutees, teachers, and educational assistants were asked to anonymously express their perceptions about the program and their suggestions for future improvement.

III. Sampling Procedures

Students were selected for participation in the program on the basis of teacher-counselor recommendation. As in the majority of special educational programs, students were chosen on the basis of academic need. Furthermore, since the students requiring extra instruction are largely included in this program, no effective control group exists at P.S. 2M, the elementary school from which the program operates.

IV. Dates of Evaluative Procedures

The majority of students in the program were pre-tested during the week of November 21, 1975. New students added to the program to replace those discharged were tested at various subsequent intervals. Among these students, only those pre-tested by February 1, 1976, are included in the evaluation.

Tutor and Tutee Personal Data Forms were completed by the Program Coordinator on March 17, 1976.

Post-testing was conducted in mid-April with data collection being completed by April 30, 1976.

Questionnaires were completed by program participants and staff on May 10, 1976.

V. Methods of Data Treatment

Methods of data treatment include

1. General frequencies: demographic characteristics such as sex, age, grade, and place of birth are tabulated in order to provide a profile of program participants.

2. t-tests: self-pairing t-tests for correlated means are computed to assess pre-test, post-test differences on the various Stanford Achievement subtests. In the absence of an adequate control group, self-pairing enables each student to serve as his own control counterpart.

3. Analysis of variance: one-way analysis of variance statistics

are computed to determine whether such factors as sex and grade are related to statistically significant pre-test, post-test differences.

Questionnaire responses are tabulated individually by each item to obtain the perceptions, criticisms, and suggestions of program participants.

CHAPTER THREE

FINDINGS

I. Demographic Findings

During the 1975-76 academic year 176 students were enrolled for extra instruction through the Tutoring: Walk and Talk Program. Table I shows that 55% of these students were male and 45% female. Although students ranged in grade level from grades 1 though 6, the majority of the students were in grades 2 through 6.

Seventy-nine percent of the students were not born in the U. S., with 48% having lived in the U. S. for less than one year. With only 1% of the students speaking English only, 99% of the students came from bilingual homes. Sixty-six percent of the students spoke an Oriental language, most notably Chinese or Vietnamese, while 31% of the students spoke Spanish. These facts underlie the English language difficulties encountered by the participants in the program.

According to Table II, 72% of the students were enrolled in the program by the end of October. Of the total number of students enrolled, 26% withdrew, the major reasons being non-attendance and moving from the district.

An organizational structure of the program is shown in Table III. Once admitted to the program and tested, students were assigned to one of five groups depending on grade level and the nature of their

academic needs. Students with lesser academic difficulties participated in the program six hours weekly, while those with greater need took part eight or ten hours weekly.

Each of the groups consisted of a licensed teacher and several tutors. Table IV provides a description of the background and characteristics of the tutors, a vital element in the program. The majority of the tutors were female, and high school students with averages above 90. Most importantly, the tutors strongly resembled the tutees or program participants in ethnic background. Ninety-five percent of the tutors were Spanish or Chinese and spoke those languages, thus facilitating rapport with their tutees. Other relevant facts are that all of the tutors planned to attend college, and that 43% were experienced tutors, having participated in the program in preceding years.

II. Evaluation Objectives - Findings

Evaluation Objective #1: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the Reading component of the program, the reading grade level of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test score and the post-test score.

Evaluation Objective #2: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the Mathematics component of the program, the mathematics grade level of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test score and the post-test score.

Evaluation Objective #3: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the Communications Skills component of the program, the communication skills grade level of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test score and the post-test score.

Evaluation of these objectives is based on data included in Tables V - VIII. Paired t-tests between pre-test and post-test means (Table V) show a difference significant at the 0.00 level for each of the three components of the program, that is, for Reading, Mathematics, and Communication Skills. The mean grade equivalent increased for each of these components as follows:

Reading: 1.80 pre-test, 2.67 post-test
Mathematics: 2.41 pre-test, 3.40 post-test
Auditory: 1.21 pre-test, 1.82 post-test

The smallest gain of six months was for Auditory or Communications Skills whereas the largest gain, one year, was for Mathematics.

These gains are substantial and significant even though the majority of the students remain below their grade level. A norm-referenced model has not been used in this analysis because of the fact that a majority of the students were not English-speaking at the time of entry into the program.

Analysis of variance data for the factor Grade are provided in Table VI. This table shows that for every pre-test and post-test, with one exception, there was a difference in student performance by grade. The exception in which the factor Grade did not yield a difference in performance was for the Auditory post-test. In general student performance on both pre-tests and post-tests increased by grade up to grade 5. (The three students in grade 7 and 8 were in the program on a trial basis.)

Table VII, an analysis of variance by Sex, shows that the factor Sex was related to a difference in performance for only the

Reading pre-test and post-test. For each of these tests the female students earned higher grade equivalent mean scores than the male students.

In Table VIII the number of program sessions students attended are categorized into intervals of 10 percent. The analysis of variance data produced show only one difference, Mathematics post-test, for this factor. This data, however, may be misleading. The interpretation cannot be made that the number of sessions students attended did not affect performance since by the time of the post-test students who were not regularly attending had withdrawn from the program.

The effect of attendance is more clearly demonstrated in Table IX where students are dichotomized into the two groups of either having attended 60% or more of the scheduled sessions vs. having attended less than 60% of sessions. Although all students improved their scores between the pre-tests and post-tests, greater gains were made by students attending more than 60% of sessions.

Evaluation Objective #4: To determine whether the implementation of the program coincides with the program as described in the project proposal.

Tutoring: Walk and Talk Program as implemented coincides with the project proposal. Students in the program are carefully assessed in terms of background and ability and grouped accordingly. They receive individualized and attentive instruction in the basic skills areas of Reading, Mathematics, and Communications Skills. Abundant and carefully selected materials are available to meet the

personal needs of every student. Above all, however, the teachers and tutors demonstrate enthusiasm and concern for the children who are in the program.

III. Questionnaire Findings

Questionnaires (Appendix) were developed and administered by the program coordinator to the tutees, and to the educational staff, including tutors and teachers.

The majority of tutees indicated that they enjoyed the program, and that the program helped improve their English, reading, and homework. They also felt that they were always helped by their teacher and their tutor. Among the things that were mentioned as most liked about the program were the field trips, the help in different academic areas, and the individual teachers. Although the majority of students claimed that there was nothing about the program that they did not like, many students on this item did mention feeling their classroom was too noisy and crowded. Among student suggestions for changes were more field trips, snacks, and increased program hours. The majority felt the program had helped them most in learning English, reading, and in homework.

Among the tutors' questionnaire responses, the following are especially informative: the majority enjoyed working in the program , and felt that the program and the field trips were useful

in teaching immigrant children. Many tutors saw their work with the children as a rewarding experience academically and in terms of personal relations. Suggestions for improving the program that were most frequently mentioned are obtaining a greater variety of materials, book, and games, and increasing the tutoring staff.

Teachers, educational assistants, and teacher aides provided thoughtful, candid comments on their open-ended questionnaire. A general consensus for improvement of the program was for more careful screening and training of tutors. Tests and learning materials more appropriate for non-English speaking students were also called for. Smaller class size, greater involvement of parents, and requisition of audio-visual equipment were other suggestions for future changes.

As noted in the participants' responses to the questionnaire, the facilities used tended to be noisy and overcrowded. Utilizing additional rooms would rectify this situation but would necessitate either additional staff or restructuring the role of the teachers.

Last year's recommendation that the children be provided snacks on a regular basis was not financially feasible for the program. It was noted, however, that many of the children provided their own refreshments.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Tutoring: Walk and Talk Program enrolled 176 students in the academic year 1975-76. The majority of students were recent immigrants from Chinese- and Spanish-speaking countries. The purpose of the program was to provide extra instruction to these students in the hopes of facilitating their learning in the areas of Reading, Mathematics, and Communications Skills.

Statistical analyses show a significant difference between the pre-tests and post-tests in the three academic areas assessed. In every instance the grade equivalent increase was equal to or in excess of the six-month duration of the program being evaluated. Norm-referenced or historical regression analyses were not undertaken because the background of the students permitted neither a fair comparison to national norms nor an accurate assessment of students' historic learning rate.

Based on the data produced by this evaluation it is reasonable to conclude that the Tutoring: Walk and Talk Program has been reaching the students for whom it was designed, and that it is assisting them educationally. Both the observations of the functioning of the program, and the results obtained statistically lead to this evaluator's recommendation that this program be continued.

On-site school visits produced one major area of concern for

improvement of the program in future years. A need was perceived for closer screening of tutors for academic background. Tutors should also be encouraged to speak to students in English as much as possible in order to accelerate the tutees' rate of learning the English language. Some tutors also require more supervision and greater structure in carrying out their responsibilities.

Tutoring: Walk and Talk is a program that is sensitive to the needs of the students and the community that it serves. It has the qualities of skilled and knowledgeable staff, good organization, and dedicated leadership. These are variables that largely contribute to its effectiveness.

TABLE I

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS IN TUTORING: WALK AND TALK PROGRAM

SEX	N	%
Male	96	55
Female	80	45
Total	176	100

GRADE		
1	15	8
2	31	18
3	32	18
4	39	22
5	31	18
6	25	14
7	1	1
8	2	1
Total	176	100

YEAR OF BIRTH		
1959-60	2	1
1961-62	6	3
1963-64	43	24
1965-66	54	31
1967-68	50	29
1969	15	9
Unknown	6	3
Total	176	100

PLACE OF BIRTH	N	%
United States	37	21
Chinese-speaking country	100	57
Spanish-speaking country	32	18
Other	1	1
Unknown	6	3
Total	176	100

LANGUAGE FLUENCY		
Oriental	116	66
Spanish	55	31
English	2	1
Other	3	2
Total	176	100

NO. OF MONTHS IN U.S.		
0-11	84	48
12-17	13	7
18-23	10	6
24-29	7	4
30-35	5	3
36-41	2	1
42-47	-	-
48-53	3	2
54-59	2	1
60 or more	4	2
Native	37	21
Unknown	9	5
Total	176	100

*The three students in grades 7 and 8 were in the program on a trial basis.

TABLE II

PROGRAM ENROLLMENT AND ATTRITION

DATE	ENROLLED N	ENROLLED %	DISCHARGED N	DISCHARGED %
Before Oct. 15	105	60	2	1
Oct. 15-Oct. 31	22	12	-	-
Nov. 1-Nov. 15	7	4	7	4
Nov. 16-Nov. 30	6	3	3	2
Dec. 1-Dec. 15	3	2	4	2
Dec. 16-Dec. 30	5	3	-	-
Jan. 1-Jan. 15	15	8	10	6
Jan. 16 and after	13	7	19	11
Total	176	100	45	26

REASON DISCHARGED		
Moved	10	22
Non-Attendance	23	51
Parents' Request	2	4
Joined Other Program	2	4
Other - Unknown	8	18
Total	45	100

*The three students in grades 7 and 8 were in the program on a trial basis.

TABLE III

1975-76 PROGRAM ORGANIZATION:
ORIGINAL GROUP ASSIGNMENTS

ESL DIVISION

Group I

N = 47

Grades: 3-6

Hours/Week: 10

Special Characteristics:
recent Chinese immigrants

Group II

N = 51

Grades: 1-6

Hours/Week: 10

Special Characteristic:
recent Spanish-speaking immigrants and language problems due to bilingual homes

Group III

N = 32

Grades: 2-3

Hours/Week: 8

Special Characteristic:
Language problems due to bilingual homes and Chinese-speaking students

BASIC SKILLS DIVISION

Group IV

N = 36

Grades: 4-6

Hours/Week: 6

Special Characteristic:
Group I and II transfers and new students

Group V

N = 10

Grades: 1-2

Hours/Week: 6

Special Characteristic:
Learning problems

TABLE IV

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM TUTORS

SEX	N	%
Male	2	10
Female	19	90
Total	21	100

GRADE		
10th	4	19
11th	5	24
12th	8	38
College	4	19
Total	21	100

ESTIMATED HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGE		
80 and above	17	81
75-79	1	5
Uncertain	3	14
Total	21	100

ETHNIC GROUP IDENTIFICATON		
Black	1	5
Chinese	13	62
Spanish	7	33
Total	21	100

LANGUAGE SPOKEN		
English only	1	5
Chinese	13	62
Spanish	7	33
Total	21	100

PLANS TO ATTEND COLLEGE	N	%
Yes	21	100
No	0	100

CAREER CHOICE		
Education	8	38
Clerical	5	24
Business	3	14
Science	2	10
Other	3	14
Total	21	100

NO. OF YEARS A TUTOR IN PROGRAM		
1	12	57
2	4	19
3	5	24
Total	21	100

TABLE V

t-TESTS FOR VARIABLES AUDITORY, READING, AND MATHEMATICS:
PRE-TEST, POST-TEST COMPARISON OF MEANS

VARIABLE	N OF CASES	MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	CORRELATION	t-VALUE	df	ONE-TAIL PROBABILITY
AUDITORY								
Pre-Test	121	1.21	0.73	0.066	0.441	7.43	120	0.00
Post-Test		1.82	0.95	0.087				
READING								
Pre-Test	119	1.80	1.03	0.095	0.736	12.80	118	0.00
Post-Test		2.67	1.01	0.093				
MATHEMATICS								
Pre-Test	120	2.41	1.40	0.127	0.776	11.77	119	0.00
Post-Test		3.40	1.32	0.121				

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A COMPARISON OF TEST PERFORMANCE BY GRADE

VARIABLE	PRE-TEST			POST-TEST		
AUDITORY	MEAN	S.D.	N	MEAN	S.D.	N
Grade						
1	0.46	0.27	11	0.78	0.63	4
2	0.92	0.51	24	1.60	0.92	19
3	1.12	0.80	24	1.56	0.68	22
4	1.30	0.46	35	1.81	0.70	31
5	1.67	0.97	29	2.14	1.10	23
6	1.54	0.82	23	2.07	1.18	22
7	0.80	0.00	1	2.50	0.00	1
8	0.35	0.35	2	2.65	0.21	2
Total	1.21	0.79	149	1.83	0.94	124
F = 6.5346	df = 7,141	p = .05		F = 8.1001	df = 7,116	p = N.S.
READING						
Grade						
1	0.46	0.54	11	0.70	0.24	4
2	1.25	0.82	26	2.46	0.78	19
3	1.00	0.92	24	2.27	1.08	21
4	1.78	0.70	36	2.58	0.69	31
5	2.19	0.93	30	2.75	0.70	23
6	2.60	1.35	25	3.23	1.45	22
7	1.30	0.00	1	1.90	0.00	1
8	0.80	0.99	2	2.75	0.21	2
Total	1.80	1.06	155	2.67	1.03	122
F = 7.7355	df = 7,147	p = .01		F = 3.9110	df = 7,114	p = .05
MATHEMATICS						
Grade						
1	0.93	0.33	11	1.12	0.57	4
2	1.28	0.73	26	1.80	0.52	19
3	2.04	0.86	25	2.81	0.87	22
4	2.58	0.92	36	3.56	0.73	30
5	3.20	1.22	29	4.26	1.05	22
6	3.32	1.86	24	4.43	1.36	22
7	2.40	0.00	1	3.20	0.00	1
8	1.05	1.34	2	3.45	0.35	2
Total	2.37	1.37	154	3.38	1.33	122
F = 11.6355	df = 7,146	p = .01		F = 17.2215	df = 7,114	p = .01

*The three students in grades 7 and 8 were in the program on a trial basis.

TABLE VII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A COMPARISON OF TEST PERFORMANCE BY SEX

VARIABLE	PRE-TEST			POST-TEST		
AUDITORY	MEAN	S.D.	N	MEAN	S.D.	N
Sex						
Male	1.14	0.81	81	1.72	0.87	65
Female	1.30	0.78	66	1.95	1.01	59
Total	1.21	0.80	147	1.83	0.94	124
F = 1.3405	df = 1,145	p = N.S.		F = 1.0310	df = 1,122	p = N.S.
READING						
Sex						
Male	1.57	1.00	83	2.43	1.10	65
Female	2.07	1.08	70	2.84	0.87	57
Total	1.80	1.06	153	2.67	1.03	122
F = 8.6202	df = 1,151	p = .01		F = 7.9438	df = 1,120	p = .01
MATHEMATICS						
Sex						
Male	2.08	1.36	84	3.28	1.30	65
Female	2.48	1.41	68	3.53	1.36	57
Total	2.37	1.38	152	3.38	1.33	122
F = 3.7789	df = 1,150	p = N.S.		F = 3.8208	df = 1,120	p = N.S.

TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE:
A COMPARISON OF TEST PERFORMANCE BY SESSIONS ATTENDED

CATEGORIES OF NUMBER OF SESSIONS ATTENDED

0 - 10%	51 - 60%
11 - 20%	61 - 70%
21 - 30%	71 - 80%
31 - 40%	81 - 90%
41 - 50%	91 - 100%

	PRE-TEST				POST-TEST		
	TOTAL MEAN	S.D.	N		TOTAL MEAN	S.D.	N
AUDITORY	1.21	0.79	149		1.83	0.94	124
F=1.3799 df=9,139 p=N.S.				F=0.8833 df=9,114 p=N.S.			
READING	1.80	1.06	155		2.67	1.03	122
F=1.5647 df=9,145 p=N.S.				F=1.1918 df=9,112 p=N.S.			
MATHEMATICS	2.37	1.37	154		3.38	1.33	122
F=1.9176 df=9,144 p=N.S.				F=2.9130 df=9,112 p=.05			

TABLE IX

A COMPARISON OF PRE-TEST, POST-TEST GRADE EQUIVALENT DIFFERENCES
BY CRITERION 60% OF SESSIONS ATTENDED

	ATTENDANCE							
	60% OR MORE OF SESSIONS				LESS THAN 60% OF SESSIONS			
VARIABLE	N	MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT	S.D.	PRE-POST DIFFERENCE	N	MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT	S.D.	PRE-POST DIFFERENCE
AUDITORY								
Pre-Test	63	1.01	0.68	+0.87	58	1.42	0.80	+0.34
Post-Test		1.88	0.93			1.76	0.98	
READING								
Pre-Test	61	1.55	0.81	+1.01	58	2.06	1.17	+0.73
Post-Test		2.56	0.71			2.79	1.25	
MATHEMATICS								
Pre-Test	62	1.98	1.00	+1.12	58	2.88	1.61	+0.84
Post-Test		3.10	0.89			3.72	1.62	

APPENDIX

TUTORING - WALK & TALK PROGRAM - QUESTIONNAIRE (PUPIL)

Check appropriate column	always	usually	sometimes	never
1. I enjoy coming to "Walk and Talk".	73 (61%)	18 (15%)	27 (23%)	1 (1%)
2. "Walk & Talk" helps me improve my English.	89 (75%)	18 (15%)	12 (10%)	--
3. "Walk & Talk" helps me improve my Reading.	80 (69%)	19 (16%)	17 (15%)	--
4. "Walk & Talk" helps me improve my Mathematics.	52 (44%)	19 (16%)	35 (29%)	13 (11%)
5. The teacher helps me with my work.	67 (57%)	24 (21%)	23 (20%)	3 (3%)
6. The tutor helps me with my work.	83 (72%)	22 (19%)	11 (9%)	--
7. "Walk & Talk" helps me improve my schoolwork.	71 (60%)	30 (25%)	17 (14%)	--
8. "Walk & Talk" helps me become a better student.	77 (65%)	29 (25%)	12 (10%)	--

Write short answers

9. The things I like most about "Walk & Talk" are: _____

_____

_____

10. Things I don't like about "Walk & Talk" are: _____

_____

_____

11. If I could change "Walk & Talk", I would do this: _____

_____

_____

12. "Walk & Talk" has helped me most in: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

TUTORING - WALK & TALK PROGRAM - QUESTIONNAIRE (TUTORS)

Check appropriate column	always	usually	sometimes	never
1. I enjoy school and consider myself a good student.	8 (50%)	7 (44%)	1 (6%)	--
2. I enjoy working as a tutor in the "Walk & Talk" program and helping the children.	9 (56%)	6 (38%)	1 (6%)	--
3. The teachers are very helpful to me as a tutor.	8 (50%)	5 (31%)	2 (13%)	1 (6%)
4. The books and materials we use are helpful in teaching the children.	5 (31%)	5 (31%)	6 (38%)	--
5. Trips are helpful in teaching immigrant children.	11 (69%)	4 (25%)	1 (6%)	--
6. Because of the tutoring experience, I think I want to become a teacher or children's worker.	4 (25%)	4 (25%)	7 (44%)	1 (6%)
7. I think the "Walk & Talk" program is useful in helping immigrant and bilingual children improve their school performance.	14 (87%)	2 (13%)	--	--

Write short answers

8. The things I like most about "Walk & Talk" are: _____

_____

_____

9. The things I don't like about "Walk & Talk" are: _____

_____

_____

10. If I could improve "Walk & Talk", I would: _____

_____

_____

11. "Walk & Talk" has helped me most by: _____

_____

_____

12. Next year I will be in grade _____ at _____ school/college.

I am interested in working in the program next year

yes no

TUTORING-Walk & Talk Program: Questionnaire
(Teachers, Educational Assistants, Teacher Aides)

Please answer each question

1. The strong points of "Walk & Talk are:
   staff: _____
   _____
   program: _____
   supplies: _____
   _____
   other: _____
   _____

2. The weak points of "Walk & Talk" are:
   staff: _____
   _____
   program: _____
   _____
   supplies: _____
   _____
   other: _____
   _____

3. I suggest the following changes for next year:
   staff: _____
   _____
   program: _____
   _____
   supplies: _____
   _____
   other: _____
   _____